

AF  
JFW



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: James K. Beriker  
Serial No.: 10/029,483  
Filed: December 20, 2001  
For: A System, Method and Apparatus for Dynamic Traffic Management on a Network  
Examiner: Willett, Stephen H.

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF AMENDED APPEAL BRIEF

1. In response to the June 4, 2007 Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief, transmitted herewith is an **AMENDED APPEAL BRIEF** in the above application.
2. A Request for a Three Month Extension of Time to October 4, 2007 is hereby requested. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 14-1131 for the fees incurred in this matter.

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 C.F.R. 1.8(a))**

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being:

**MAILING**

- ☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

**FACSIMILE**

- ☐ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office.

Date: October 3, 2007

  
Signature

Hannah Martin  
(name of person certifying)

(Transmittal of Appeal Brief—page 1 of 2)

3. FEE FOR FILING APPEAL BRIEF

The fees for filing the Appeal Brief were previously paid on January 16, 2007.

4. FEE PAYMENT


Charge Account No. 14-1131 for any additional fees which may be incurred.

56. FEE DEFICIENCY

If any additional extension and/or fee is required, this is a request therefor and to charge Account No. 14-1131.

Date: October 3, , 2007

Tel. No.: (312) 236-0733

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER  
Arthur A. Gasey - Reg. No. 35,150  
Niro, Scavone, Haller & Niro  
181 W. Madison-Suite 4600  
Chicago, IL 60602



**IN THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Applicant:	James K. Beriker	)	
Assignee:	Value Click, Inc	)	
Serial No.:	10/029,483	)	Group Art Unit: 2142
Filed:	December 20, 2001	)	Examiner: Willett, Stephan H.
Provisional Filed:	December 21, 2000	)	
Provisional SN:	60/257,695	)	
For:	A System, Method and	)	
	Apparatus for Dynamic Traffic	)	
	Management on a Network	)	Docket No. 3553

Honorable Commissioner of  
Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**APPEAL BRIEF**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST .....	1
III. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES .....	1
IV. STATUS OF CLAIMS .....	1
V. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS .....	1
VI. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....	1
VII. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL .....	5
VIII. ARGUMENT .....	5
A. Rejection under McBrearty in view of Boyd et al.....	5
B. Rejection of Claims 2-4 .....	7
IX. CONCLUSION .....	8

## **BRIEF ON APPEAL**

### **INTRODUCTION**

This is an appeal brief in response to the final rejection dated January 5, 2006 (Exhibit A) and is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal mailed July 8, 2006 (Exhibit B).

#### **I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest is Search123.com, Inc., which is a wholly owned subsidiary of ValueClick, Inc. (publicly traded under ticker symbol VCLK).

#### **II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

There are no appeals or interferences known to Appellant relevant to these proceedings.

#### **III. STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-5 are on appeal.

Claims 1-5 (rejected).

#### **IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

Applicant filed an Information Disclosure Statement and an amendment in response to the Examiner's Final Rejection on March 13, 2006 (Exhibit E). In response, on March 30, 2006, the Examiner filed an Advisory Action indicating that for purposes of appeal, the amendment would not be entered. (Exhibit F). Furthermore, the Examiner indicated that he had considered the amendment, but that he believed the amendment did not place the application in condition for allowance. Id.

#### **V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

##### **(a) General**

The invention relates to an improved traffic management system and method. More specifically, the application claims dynamic traffic management over a network (claims 1

and 5), and where a referral provider provides preferences via traffic management parameters including a designated target location and a set of key search terms (claim 2), and a search referral module which routes traffic to the designated target location (claim 3) and compares a user's search terms to the key search terms from the referral provider (claim 4).

Applicant's independent claim 1 recites a system wherein a referral provider predefines preferences (i.e., traffic management parameters) via the traffic management system in order to dynamically route traffic generated by a user computer's search request transmitted to the referral provider such that the routing of the traffic is dependent upon the search request transmitted by the user computer. The system thus requires: 1) a traffic management system; 2) a referral provider computer; 3) a user computer; 4) a means for establishing an account for the referral provider; 5) at least one traffic management parameter; and 6) a search referral module, which analyses the request from the user computer and dynamically routes the user traffic in response to the user's request.

The support for the traffic management system is shown in Figure 1, figure element 28, while the referral provider computer is Figure 1, figure element 14, and the interaction of the referral provider and traffic management system are shown for instance in figure 1 and discussed, for example, from approximately page 5, line 21, to page 6, line 19, of the specification (Exhibit G). The user computer (Figure 1, figure element 12) is discussed on page 5, lines 10-25, of the specification. (Exhibit G). The system of claim 1 further comprises a means for establishing an account for the referral provider, wherein the account includes an account name, a unique identification and a password. This element is a means plus function element, with structure corresponding to the claim element found

in the specification, for example at Figure 2 and page 6, line 23, to about page 7, line 6 (discussing the 'Set up Account' button, 'or any other interface that may be suitable'). The claim element for "at least one traffic management parameter" is found at Figure 2 and in the specification at page 7, line 7, to page 9, line 5. Finally, the search referral module, for analyzing the user computer's search request is supported by Figure 2, figure elements 50 and 52 and is discussed in the specification at page 9, line 10 through page 10, line 4.

Claim 2 further limits the traffic management parameters of claim 1 to require at least one designated target location and a set of key search terms. Support for the designated target location (discussing, for example primary target and alternative locations) may be found at Figure 2, figure elements 40 and 42, and is discussed in the specification at page 7, lines 7-29, and page 8, line 25 – page 9, line 5. Support for the key search terms is shown in Figure 2, figure elements 40 and 44, and page 8, lines 7-17, which notes, among other things, that "the key term list generally selected by, or provided to, the referral provider is identical to all of the key terms purchased by third parties (e.g., information providers) from the primary location."

Independent claim 5 is a method claim which requires 1) dynamically managing traffic on a network having a referral provider computer and a user computer; 2) establishing a participant account for the referral provider; 3) defining traffic management parameters; 4) analyzing a search request input by the user computer; and 5) routing traffic to a target location. The support for "dynamically managing traffic" is the same as that cited for the "traffic management system," "referral provider computer," and the "user computer" discussed in reference to claim 1, above. The support for "establishing a participant account" is the same as the "means for establishing an account" as set forth in

claim 1, above. The support for “analyzing a search request” is found at Figure 2, figure element 50, and is discussed at page 9, lines 10-26. The support for “routing traffic” is at Figure 2, figure element 52, and is discussed at page 9, line 27-page 10, line 4.

The sole means plus function element of the claims is the “means for establishing an account” element of claim 1, and is discussed above.

**(b) Reference to line numbers for independent claims**

***All paragraph reference numbers refer to the published application number 2002/0091879 A1***

Claim 1. A system for providing traffic management on a computer network (**Fig. 1 entire figure, [0010]**), wherein a referral provider (**Fig. 1, ref. 14, [0010]**) and a user computer (**Fig. 1, ref 12**) are in communication via the computer network (**Fig. 1, [0020]**), the referral provider predefining referral provider preferences (**[0032]**) via the traffic management system (**[0010], abstract**) for routing traffic generated (**original claim 1, [0002]**) by the user computer's search request (**[0009], [0026]**) transmitted to the referral provider (**[0010]**), wherein the routing of the traffic is dependent (**original claim 1**) upon the search request (**[0026]**) transmitted by the user computer, comprising:

means for establishing an account for the referral provider (**[0035]**), wherein the account includes an account name, a unique identification and a password (**original claim 1, [0026]**);

at least one traffic management parameter (**[0026]**); and

a search referral module (**[0038]**), wherein the search referral module analyzes the user computer's search request (**[0036]**).

**Defined structure for: “means for establishing an account” Structure defined in [0026] including computer running “traffic management system” (Fig. 1, (28) including structure in [0024])**

Claim 5. A process for dynamically managing traffic on a network having a referral provider computer and a user computer (**Fig. 1, 12**), the user computer communicating with the referral provider computer (**Fig. 1, 14**)



and transmitting a search request to the referral provider computer (**abstract, [0010]**), comprising:

establishing a participating account (**[0035]**), wherein the account is established by the referral provider (**[0035]**);

defining traffic management parameters (**0026]**);

analyzing the search request input by the user computer (**[0036]**);

and

routing traffic to a target location (**[0002]**, **original claim 1**.

## **VI. GROUND S OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) based on McBrearty (U.S. Patent No. 6,823,491) (Exhibit C) in view of Boyd et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0193489) (Exhibit D).

## **VII. ARGUMENT**

### **A. Rejection under McBrearty in view of Boyd et al.**

The Examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 5, as reflected in the March 30, 2006 Advisory Action, is based upon a misunderstanding of the preambles of those claims in light of current Federal Circuit law. Specifically, the Advisory Action states that "[a] preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness, but instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone." (Exhibit F at p. 2, citation omitted). Yet, as shown above, the traffic management system, the user computer, and the referral provider computer are all structures, not intended functions. The preamble is necessary to provide completeness to the claim – for instance, the means for establishing an account requires "the referral provider" which structure is first identified in the preamble and later referred to

in the body of the claim. Likewise, the preamble provides antecedent basis for the “user computer” structure which is referred to again in the body of the claim in order to make the “search referral module” element complete. Indeed the “traffic management parameters” is incomplete and meaningless absent a “traffic management system” to route or act upon a user computer request. As the Federal Circuit has noted, where, “when read in the context of the entire claim,” the preamble “recites limitations of the claim . . . or . . . is ‘necessary to give life, meaning, and vitality’ to” the claim, the preamble language is properly treated as limiting. *Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*, 182 F.3d 1298, 1305 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Thus, the Applicant’s inventions, when the preamble is given any weight, is clearly distinguishable from McBrearty and Boyd et al.

Namely, unlike Applicant’s invention, which involves dynamic traffic management over a network, McBrearty addresses the problem of a web surfer who needs quick access to the site-specific search engine of a web site. The example McBrearty gives is the intra-site search engine one might find at <http://www.ibm.com>. (Exhibit C, figures 1 and 2) McBrearty discloses that sometimes users “enter” a site on a page lacking the site-specific search engine interface. (Exhibit C, figure 6). McBrearty discloses providing a “button” on a web browser that will locate the site-specific engine for presentment to the surfer, or if there is none preexisting on the site, that will present the surfer with a generic one.

While McBrearty does mention ordinary use of the site-specific search engine to perform a search, McBrearty does not disclose dynamic traffic management as claimed by Applicant. Namely, Applicant’s claim 1 recites a system wherein a referral provider predefines preferences (i.e., traffic management parameters) for routing traffic generated by a user computer’s search request transmitted to the referral provider. McBrearty does

not disclose a referral provider, or predefining preferences, as claimed. In addition, as the Examiner acknowledged McBrearty lacks a means for establishing an account. (Exhibit A, at p. 3).

The Examiner cites Boyd et al. for its disclosure of details of implementing an account for a referrer. However, Boyd does not disclose establishing an account by a referral provider as claimed. Boyd's disclosed accounts are associated with hosted incentive marketing --- an entirely different field from Applicant's invention having nothing to do with dynamic traffic management in the context of search engines. For example, under Boyd's teachings, the user set up an account to keep track of his "incentive points" (Exhibit D, par. 32). Likewise, a consumer product company might establish an account to keep track of consumer-entered loyalty points. (Exhibit D, at par. 107). Importantly, neither the consumer product company nor the consumer in this context qualifies as a "referral provider" -- even the Examiner's own rejection alleges a different third party (Yahoo!) is the referral provider. (Exhibit A, at p. 3) Neither the user nor the consumer product company does anything having the effect of referring a user's network traffic to a third party network location. Thus, neither McBrearty nor Boyd et al., either alone or in combination, suggest the elements required by claims 1 and 5 of the present application.

#### **B. Rejection of Claims 2-4**

As an additional, but separate basis for reversing the Examiner's rejection of claims 2-4, the applicant submits that the Examiner's understanding and application of McBrearty to the use of "key search terms" is misplaced. Specifically, the specification states the following about such search terms:

Generally, the key terms chosen or identified by the referral provider are associated with key terms which have been purchased or otherwise provide income to the primary location. In preferred embodiments, the key term list


generally selected by or provided to, the referral provider is identical to all of the key terms purchased by third parties (e.g., information providers) from the primary location. In this manner, the referral provider is substantially guaranteed that all of the traffic directed to the primary location will produce income for the referral provider because all of the key terms have been paid for by information providers (e.g., web masters) whose identification or web location will be given preferential positioning within the result list present to the user.

(Exhibit G, page 8, lines 7-15). In other words, “key search terms” – as defined by the intrinsic record, are terms which have been purchased by a third party or are terms which have been provided and guaranteed by the third party to provide income to the referral provider, in exchange for preferential positions of web listings in response to user searches referencing the same key terms. Again, McBrearty suggests – at most – a site specific direction of traffic, not any “key search terms” which have been paid for by a third party to give a preferential placement of web location in response to user searches having the same key terms. Indeed, with a site specific search function like McBrearty, there would be no suggestion or teaching to develop of system whereby a different, third party would pay for preferential listings of a web location using key search terms. Again, McBrearty simply does not teach or suggest the combination of claim 2 (upon which claims 3-4 also depend).

#### **VIII. CONCLUSION**

McBrearty and Boyd do not result in, or suggest, the claimed inventions of claims 1 or 5, and thus the rejection of the pending claims must be reversed. As an independent reason for reversal, McBrearty and Boyd do not result in, or suggest the use of key search terms for a dynamic traffic management system, and thus the inventions of claims 2-4 must be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Arthur A. Gasey  
Reg. No. 35,150  
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: October 3, 2007

NIRO, SCAVONE, HALLER & NIRO  
181 West Madison Street, Suite 4600  
Chicago, Illinois 60602  
(312) 236-0733  
(312) 236-3137 (facsimile)



## CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A system for providing traffic management on a computer network, wherein a referral provider and a user computer are in communication via the computer network, the referral provider predefining referral provider preferences via the traffic management system for routing traffic generated by the user computer's search request transmitted to the referral provider, wherein the routing of the traffic is dependent upon the search request transmitted by the user computer, comprising:

means for establishing an account for the referral provider, wherein the account includes an account name, a unique identification and a password;

at least one traffic management parameter; and

a search referral module, wherein the search referral module analyzes the user computer's search request.

2. A system as claimed in claim 1, the management parameters comprise at least one of a designated target location, and a set of key search terms.

3. A system as claimed in claim 2, wherein the search referral module routes traffic to the designated target location.

4. A system as claimed in claim 2, wherein the search request comprises a set of user defined search terms, and wherein the referral module compares the user defined search terms and the predefined set of key search terms of the management parameters.

5. A process for dynamically managing traffic on a network having a referral provider computer and a user computer, the user computer communicating with the referral provider computer and transmitting a search request to the referral provider computer, comprising:

establishing a participating account, wherein the account is established by the referral provider;

defining traffic management parameters;

analyzing the search request input by the user computer; and

routing traffic to a target location.

## EVIDENCE APPENDIX

Exhibit A .....	January 5, 2006 Final Rejection
Exhibit B .....	July 8, 2006 Notice of Appeal
Exhibit C .....	McBrearty (U.S. Patent No. 6,823,491)
Exhibit D .....	Boyd et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0193489)
Exhibit E .....	March 13, 2006 Amendment
Exhibit F .....	March 30, 2006 Advisory Action
Exhibit G .....	Specification

There is no evidence submitted pursuant to 37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132 of record.





# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,483	12/20/2001	Beriker	63030.800US01	5460

7590 01/10/2006

Niro Scavone Haller & Niro  
181 West Madison Street  
Suite 4600  
Chicago, IL 60602

EXAMINER

WILLETT, STEPHAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2006

*first-esp due  
4-10-06  
UL*

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**



Application No.

10/029,483

Applicant(s)

BERIKER, JAMES

Examiner

Stephan F. Willett

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *IDS*

1. The IDS filed on 11/25/02 referenced numerous other documents. The Office does not have copies of said documents, thus would you please provide copies of the documents listed in said IDS.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McBrearty with Patent Number 6,823,491 in view of Boyd et al. with Patent Publication US2004/0193489.
1. Regarding claim(s) 1, 5, McBrearty teaches a search referral module[Yahoo search engine] that analyzes[by relevance] the user's search request as the "the search engine then returns pages", col. 3, line 43-44 based on pages "that appear to be relevant", col. 3, lines 44-45 based on a web browser running on a user's computer and Yahoo Company is the "referral provider". McBrearty teaches at least one traffic management parameter[user's search terms], col. 3 lines 40-46. McBrearty teaches the referral mode routes traffic to the designated location by the search engine, col. 3, lines 48-49.

Art Unit: 2142

2. McBrearty teaches the invention in the above claim(s) except for explicitly teaching establishing an account for the referral provider, wherein the account includes an account name, unique identifier and password.

3. In that McBrearty operates refer a specific site, the artisan would have looked to the network referral arts for details of implementing an account for a referrer. In that art, Boyd, a related network application hosting system, teaches "the user would register himself ... to set up an account", para. 0032, lines 4-6 in order to take advantage of the service provided. Boyd specifically teaches "user name, ID, password", para. 0092, lines 9-10. Further, Boyd suggests "the sellers need to register and set up an account", para. 107, lines 3-4 will result from implementing the service and accounts.

4. The motivation to incorporate account information insures that the service provider receives remuneration.

5. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate establishing an account for the referral provider, wherein the account includes an account name, unique identifier and password for a user as taught in Boyd into the referral system described in the McBrearty patent because McBrearty operates with hosting accounts and Boyd suggests that an account would be used to record the users' data or to enable access to Yahoo services.

Therefore, by the above rational, the above claim(s) are rejected.

6. Regarding claim(s) 2, McBrearty teaches management parameters comprise designated target location as a site specific URL and key search terms col. 5, lines 1-4.

7. Regarding claim(s) 3, McBrearty the referral mode routes traffic to the designated location, col. 5, lines 12-14.

Art Unit: 2142

8. Regarding claim(s) 4, McBearty teaches the search request comprises a set of user defined terms, col. 4, lines 6-10 and the referral module compares the search terms with predefined key terms, col. 5, lines 2-6.

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The broad claim language used is interpreted on its face and based on this interpretation the claims have been rejected.

2. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "McBearty does not disclose dynamic traffic management as claimed", "predefined preferences", Paper Dated 10/3/05, Page 23, lines 17-21) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Thus, Applicant's arguments can not be held as persuasive regarding patentability.

3. Applicant suggests their application "McBearty does not disclose a referral provider", Paper Filed 10/3/05, Page 3, line 21. However, McBearty teaches "Yahoo", col. 3, line 42. Thus, Applicant's arguments can not be held as persuasive regarding patentability.

### ***Conclusion***

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

10. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

Art Unit: 2142

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephan Willett whose telephone number is (571)272-3890. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

12. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell, can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)273-8300.

13. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571)272-2100.


sfw

January 5, 2006



ANDREW CALDWELL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

<b>Notice of References Cited</b>	Application/Control No. 10/029,483	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination BERIKER, JAMES	
	Examiner Stephan F. Willett	Art Unit 2142	Page 1 of 1



**U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS**

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	A	US-2004/0193489	09-2004	Boyd et al.	705/014
	B	US-			
	C	US-			
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

**FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS**

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

**NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS**

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

\*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)  
 Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.